

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Objections to the Drawings

The Office action objected to the drawings because they included some reference characters that are not mentioned in the description and because they did not include some reference characters that were mentioned in the description. In addition, a request to change “80” to --82-- in Fig. 3 was made.

The requested changes to the drawings and the specification have been made. Applicant submits that the changes to the drawings do not constitute new matter, but instead are supported by the specification. The reference numerals that were requested to be added were added in paragraph 23, and their addition is consistent with the description in that paragraph that “the last two numbers for like elements are the same, but the first number indicates the element for that specific example.” Applicant submits that the objections to the drawings should therefore be withdrawn.

The Objections to the Specification

The requested corrections to the specification have been made.

The Section 112 Rejection of the Claims

The claims objected to under Section 112 have been cancelled.

The Rejections Based Upon Prior Art

The claims of the application were rejected based upon two primary references, U.S. Patent No. 4,352,362 to Nichols and U.S. Patent No. 2,938,524 to Benson. Applicant submits that the new claims in the application are not shown by, or made obvious in view of, these references.

Applicant has cancelled the previous claims in the application, and has drafted the above new set of claims. The new set includes one independent claim, claim 21. This claim is directed to a tent having, *inter alia*, a structure for supporting sidewalls of a tent from a pole, the structure including a first support, a second support, and a third support. The first support suspends the sidewalls at a first position adjacent to the top and supports the first position a first distance from the pole. The second support suspends the sidewalls at a second position adjacent to the attachment of the pole at or near the floor edges and is spaced from that attachment, and the second support is configured to support the second position a second distance from the pole. A third support is provided for suspending the sidewalls at a third position between the first and second positions. The third support is configured to support the third position a third distance from the pole. The third distance is greater than the first distance. In addition, the third distance is greater than the second distance.

The asymmetrical configuration of the connecting structure of the pole to the sidewalls in new claim 21 is not shown by or made obvious in view of the cited references. *Nichols* discloses asymmetrical pole sleeves, but the pole sleeves are asymmetrical only in that they are wider near the stakes or corners of the tent and narrower at an apex of the tent. Thus, the pole sleeves are asymmetrical in that they are wide at a corner, narrow at the top and then wide again at the opposite corner. In contrast, the structure defined in claim 21 is narrow near the floor edges of the tent (yet spaced from the floor edges), wide between the floor edges and the top of the tent, and then narrow again near the top of the tent. *Nichols* does not show such a configuration. Similarly, *Benson* does not show such a configuration. In fact, *Benson* supports its tent at only two locations for each sidewall: a position near the top, and a position midway up the tent. In exact contrast to the structure defined in claim 21, the sidewalls in *Benson* are spaced close at a center portion, and spaced farther at top and floor edge portions (in Fig. 1), or at a minimum are spaced farther at top portions than at a central portion (Fig. 4). Moreover, the reference does not disclose an equivalent to the second support, in which sidewalls are suspended adjacent to the floor edges and spaced from the floor edges.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the new claims should not be rejected based upon the cited prior art.

Because the Applicant submits that the Claim 1 is allowable, the dependent claims are allowable at least because they are dependent upon an allowable claim. Nevertheless, applicant submits that the dependent claims further define additional subject matter now shown or described in the prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

This Amendment is believed to be timely filed and no additional claim fees are due. However, in the event that any extension of time or fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 12-1216.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger D. Wylie/

Roger D. Wylie, Reg. No. 36,974
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, on the date shown below.

Date: June 26, 2006

/Roger D. Wylie/

Roger D. Wylie